

REMARKS

The drawings were objected to because Claim 17 referenced something not shown in the drawings. Claim 17 has been canceled, thereby overcoming this objection.

The Examiner notes that the applicant's drawings show two housing casings 1 and 2 that, when assembled, comprise a housing. Indeed this is described on page 3, line 8 of the specification where it is stated that the housing comprises a base 1 and a cover 2. This confusion may have arisen because the first paragraph of Claim 1 refers to a housing and paragraph 3 later refers to a case assembly comprising a housing. To alleviate this confusion the later reference to "a case assembly comprising a housing" has been eliminated from Claim 1 and from the rewritten claims which include the subject matter of Claim 1.

The drawings show biasing elements 3 arranged along the interior surface of the housing 1,2. A conductor of each wire 6a,6b of the two-wire cable is electrically connected to each biasing element 3 as shown in Fig. 1D. Claim 1 has been amended to be consistent to this showing of the drawings.

The phrase "the contact of" has been deleted from Claim 3 to overcome the lack of an antecedent.

It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing changes address the objections noted by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. 4,285,562 (Teagno et al.) Amended Claim 1 describes a double electrode connector comprising a double-electrode connector housing comprising a base having two holes therein of predetermined diameters arranged at predetermined locations in the housing, with a first of the two holes associated with a first connector and a second of the two holes associated with a second connector of the double-electrode connector; a pair of manually adjustable

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

biasing elements arranged along a surface of the housing so that each one of the pair of biasing elements is adapted for biasing against one of a pair of electrode studs when the studs are inserted in a respective hole of the two holes in the housing; and a two-wire cable, and a pair of metal contacts electrically connected to the biasing elements, wherein each one of the pair of metal contacts is coupled to one of a first conductor and second conductor of the two-wire cable. Applicant's inventive connector enables one connector to connect and remove two wires to and from two electrode studs by simple adjustment of the manually adjustable biasing elements of the connector. Teagno et al. show a circuit board connector which can be pressed onto ribs of a printed circuit board. As the connector is pressed into place, the ribs automatically spread apart the spring contacts which engage the ribs. The spring contacts remain spread and in contact with the ribs for as long as the connector is engaged on the printed circuit board. There is no manual adjustment of the spring contacts of the Teagno et al. connector. The contacts are enclosed in a housing and cannot be touched during use, and their spreading happens automatically when the connector is forced onto the ribs 36 of the printed circuit board. When the connector is removed from the board, it is simply pulled away from the ribs and the spring contacts automatically spring closed to their original condition. This is no different from the spring element of a conventional snap-fit connector for an electrode stud, which snaps on and snaps off. It is respectfully submitted that the use of manually adjustable biasing elements for a double electrode connector patentable distinguishes Claim 1 and its dependent Claims 3, 6, 7 and 8 over Teagno et al.

Amended Claim 18 describes a method of making a double electrode connector, connecting the steps of (a) providing a connector housing comprising a base having two holes therein

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

of predetermined diameters arranged at predetermined locations in the housing, with a first of the two holes associated with a first connector and a second of the two holes associated with a second connector of the double-electrode connector; (b) arranging a pair of biasing elements along a surface of the housing so that each one of the pair of biasing elements is adapted for biasing against an electrode stud inserted in a respective hole of the two holes in the housing; (c) providing a two wire cable, a pair of metal contacts, and connecting each one of the pair of metal contacts to one of the first conductor wire and second conductor wire, and a bend relief connecting the two wire cable to the housing of the case assembly; and (d) providing a manual control for simultaneously biasing the pair of biasing elements away from the electrode studs inserted in the holes. By simple operation of the manual control a user can simultaneously connect the two wires of the connector to two electrode studs and release the connector just as simply. In the Teagno et al. devices there is no manual control by which the user can bias the spring contacts away from the ribs 36, either before connection or when releasing the connector. Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 18 and its dependent Claim 20 are not anticipated by Teagno et al.

Claim 7, which depends from Claim 1, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by combining US Pat. 5,782,892 (Castle et al.) with Teagno et al. Castle et al. was cited for its showing of the use of two differently sized holes 70 and 84. However this is not remarkable, since holes 70 and 84 are for engagement with different types of connectors, a lead connector end assembly 12 and one of a set of unipolar connector pins 82 and 84. This reference would be relevant if the holes that were to be engaged at the same time, holes 82 and 84, were of different sizes. In that instance it would conceptually be similar to a double electrode connector which

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

is the subject of Claims 1 and 7. But as Figs. 6, 7, 8, and 9 of Castle et al. show, holes 82 and 84 are of the same size. Furthermore, there are no manually adjustable biasing elements as recited in base Claim 1. For these reasons it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Castle et al. and Teagno et al. cannot render Claim 7 unpatentable.

Claims 13, 17, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teagno et al. in view of US Pat. 5,895,298 (Faupel et al.) Faupel et al. has a button 18 which is depressed to spread arms 24, 26 so that a connector 10 can engage a single button connector 35. Claim 13 depends from Claim 1 and Claim 20 depends from Claim 18. With regard to Claim 13, the combination of Teagno et al. and Faupel et al. do not show a pair of manually adjustable biasing elements for a pair of electrode studs. Faupel et al. can only work with a single button connector and Teagno et al. have no manually adjustable biasing elements at all. As for Claim 20, there is not manual control for simultaneously biasing a pair of biasing element away from two electrode studs as called for by base Claim 18. Moreover, Faupel et al. at the bottom of column 1 cautions against using the design of an ECG or EEG electrode such as that of the present invention for his biopotential electrode and vice versa, suggesting that the combination the Examiner wants to make should not be done. For these reasons it is respectfully submitted that Claims 13 and 20 are patentable over the combination of Teagno et al. and Faupel et al.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 9-12, 14-16 and 19 were allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly Claims 2, 4, 12, and 19 have been rewritten in independent form. Claim 12 has been clarified to state that the self-storage knobs protrude "in alignment with" the two holes, as they do not literally protrude "from" the holes. Claims 5, 9-11, and 14-16 all

- 16 -

depend from the rewritten claims and should now be allowable by reason of this dependency.

The other references cited by the Examiner but not applied have been reviewed and are not believed to affect the patentability of the above claims.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, and 18 are not anticipated by Teagno et al., that Claims 7, 13, and 20 are patentable over Teagno et al. in combination with Castle et al. and Faupel et al., and that Claims 2, 4, 5, 9-12, 14-16 and 19 are now in allowable form. Accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and of Claims 7, 13, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn and that Claims 1-16 and 18-20 be passed on to issuance.

In light of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DANIEL A SILBER

By: W B Brinton Yorks, Jr.  
W. Brinton Yorks, Jr.  
Reg. No. 28,923

Philips Electronics  
22100 Bothell Everett Highway  
P.O. Box 3003  
Bothell, WA 98041-3003  
(425) 487-7152  
April 12, 2006

BEST AVAILABLE COPY